

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	Э.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/325,143		06/03/1999	CHIN-HUI LEE	LEE22-1	2458	
27964	7590	0 02/03/2004		EXAMINER		
HITT GA	INES	P.C.	GAUTHIER, GERALD			
P.O. BOX RICHARI		'0 TX 75083		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	Í			2645	24	
				DATE MAILED: 02/03/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
'Advisory Action	09/325,143	LEE, CHIN-HUI ET AL.	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gerald Gauthier	2645	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 07 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avignal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this an oevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The apportion or in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelNOTE: .	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	s.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5.⊠ The a)⊠ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)□ request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>		idered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	

10. Other: ____

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant states on page 2 last paragraph according to the MPEP 715.04 last paragraph that if a joint inventor is unavailable, signatures from the remaining inventors are sufficient for the 1.131 Affidavit.

The arguments of counsel cannot take place of evidence of the record to show the unavalability of the inventor, rather factual evidence that show why the inventor is unavailable to sign the 1,131 Affidavit therefore the 1.131 affidavit will not be considered.

FAN TSANG
SUPERINTENT EXAMINER
144 PARKEY CONTER 2600

2